

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_128264
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact Of Temporal Variability Of Rainfall ON Groundwater Quality OF Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu, India
Type of the Article	Research article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study contributes to the literature on aquifer research. At the local level, it highlights the level of groundwater pollution in the municipality. This study can serve as a basis for decision-making regarding the provision of drinking water for households in the municipality.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article suitable but I suggest "Impact Of Temporal Variability Of Rainfall ON Groundwater Quality OF Dindigul District, India"	Title revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the abstract, the objectives and results are well-defined. However, I notice the absence of the methodology and tools used, as well as the implications of the article. In this regard, I suggest integrating the aforementioned elements.	Revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	Thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references: 1. Potential impact of rainfall variability on groundwater resources: a case study in Uttar Pradesh, India 2. Climate variability impact on groundwater quality in Small Island Developing States: Mauritius Island as a case study 3. Meteorological Variability and Groundwater Quality: Examples in Different Hydrogeological Settings	Revision made

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language English is quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Your analysis highlights important points regarding the organization and presentation of the scientific article. Here is a summary of the corrections needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Position of elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Table in the conclusion: If relevant, it should be moved to an appendix or a more appropriate section, such as results or discussion. ○ Study area: This should be integrated into the methodology rather than being an independent section. 2. Abstract and discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These sections need to be rewritten to better distinguish the results (raw facts) from their interpretation (discussion of implications and comparisons). 3. Inconsistencies in graphics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some graphics are labeled as "pictures," while others are "figures." Consistency is essential, and the term "figure" is generally preferred in scientific publications. ○ Figure titles: Titles should be placed below the figures, in line with scientific norms. 4. Position of the study area description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This section is inappropriately placed in the document. It should be part of the methodology at the beginning, to provide context for the study. <p>General suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a rigorous structure: Introduction → Methodology (including the study area) → Results → Discussion → Conclusion. • Ensure terminological and visual consistency (figures, tables). • Check the target journal's guidelines to ensure that the format meets their requirements. <p>These adjustments will improve the clarity and overall quality of the article.</p>	<p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Noted</p>

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	